

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets (page numbers 1/31 and 2/31) of drawings replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-18 are pending, of which claims 3-18 have been withdrawn. Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter of claim 2. Claim 1 has been amended to correct informalities in claim language.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the title and abstract of the disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made to the specification overcome these objections.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made to the drawings overcome this objection. In the amendment, FIGS. 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify the path of a signal by bold lines.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (USP 6,980,585). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

As the Examiner concedes, Yamada fails to disclose “control means for switching a storage of the receive data ... *before or after de-spreading*” as recited by claim 1. However, the Examiner asserts that if the de-spreading signal is stored, it does not matter if it is before or after the reverse diffusion. Applicant disagrees.

When the rake combining or channel estimation equalizing is carried out after de-spreading, the amount of the required memory is likely to increase depending on the number of paths or the number of symbols. The claimed subject matter can switch a storage of the receive data *before or after de-spreading* in order to suppress the amount of the required memory.

Yamada fails to recognize or even suggest this problem and thus fails to disclose the effect of switching a storage of the receive data. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamada fails to disclose *control means for switching* a storage of the receive data which are the object to be detected synchronously in the storage means *before or after de-spreading*.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamada does not render claim 1 obvious because Yamada fails to recognize the above discussed problem and fails to disclose the above discussed element of claim 1, further, there is no motivation or suggestion to modify Yamada to arrive at the claimed subject matter. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1. Also, since base claim 1 is now patentable, claim 2 is now in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection of claim 2.

CONCLUSION

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TS:MaM
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: April 13, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**